

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 17, 20, 24, 28, 34, 41, 42, 49, 56, 58, 72, 74 have been amended. Claims 2, 15, 16, 18, 19, 48, 57, and 73 are canceled. Claims 1, 3-14, 17, 20-47, 49-56, 58-72, and 74-94 remain in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of claims 2, 15, and 16, and by rectifying the recitation in its preamble. Claim 1 therefore corresponds essentially to claim 16 rewritten to independent form. Claims 3, 7, and 10 have been amended to rectify an informality in dependency caused by cancellation of claim 2.

Claim 17 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of claims 18 and 19. Claim 17 therefore corresponds to claim 19 rewritten to independent form. Claims 20, 24, 28, and 34 have been amended to rectify an informality in dependency caused by cancellation of claims 18 and 19. Claim 41 has been amended to rectify a manifest informality in antecedent basis.

Claim 42 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of claim 48. Claim 42 therefore corresponds to claim 48 rewritten to independent form. Claim 49 has been amended to rectify an informality in dependency caused by cancellation of claim 48.

Claim 56 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of claim 57. Claim 56 therefore corresponds to claim 57 rewritten to independent form. Claim 58 has been amended to rectify an informality in dependency caused by cancellation of claim 57.

Claim 72 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of claim 73. Claim 72 therefore corresponds to claim 73 rewritten to independent form. Claim 74 has been amended to rectify an informality in dependency caused by cancellation of claim 73.

Claim 1 has been rejected for being directed to non statutory subject matter. It is submitted that the amendment to the preamble of claim 1 removes the grounds for this rejection.

Claims 17, 18, and 24 are rejected for anticipation by US Patent 5,987,024 ("Duch"). This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 18 and the amendments to claim 17.

Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 15, 42-44, 56, and 72 are rejected for obviousness over Duch in view of US Patent 6,522,665 ("Suzuki"). This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 2 and the amendments to claims 1, 42, 56, and 72.

The examiner has indicated that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claim 1 as amended now corresponds to claim 16 rewritten in

independent form. Claim 1 is therefore allowable as are claims 3-14 which depend from claim 1.

The examiner has indicated that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claim 17 as amended now corresponds to claim 19 rewritten in independent form. Claim 17 is therefore allowable as are claims 20-41 which depend from claim 17.

The examiner has indicated that claim 48 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claim 42 as amended now corresponds to claim 48 rewritten in independent form. Claim 42 is therefore allowable as are claims 43-47 and 49-55 which depend from claim 42.

The examiner has indicated that claim 57 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claim 56 as amended now corresponds to claim 57 rewritten in independent form. Claim 56 is therefore allowable as are claims 58-71 which depend from claim 56.

The examiner has indicated that claim 73 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claim 72 as amended now corresponds to claim 73 rewritten in independent form. Claim 72 is therefore allowable as are claims 74-94 which depend from claim 72.

Accordingly, all claims remaining in the application are allowable, early notice of which is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,



TERRANCE A. MEADOR  
Reg. No. 30, 298

Date: *November 23, 2004*

INCAPLAW  
1050 Rosecrans Street, Suite K  
San Diego, CA 92106

Telephone: (619) 222-2531 Fax: (619) 222-2327